



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
ISSUE NO. 8
DECEMBER 2000

In this issue . . .

Watch Out for the "Third Man Death"	2
A Look at the Law	10
Board Member Update	15
Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology	15
Disciplinary Actions	16
Experts Sought for Board Enforcement Case Review	17
Assembly Bill 400	18
School Exam Results for Written Examinations	19
School Exam Results for Oral Examinations	21

New Regulations Approved:

Section 1387 of the California Code of Regulations Supervised Professional Experience

On July 6, 2000 the Office of Administrative Law approved the board's regulatory action to adopt sections 1387.1, 1387.2, and 1387.4 and to amend sections 1387, 1387.3, and 1387.5 of the California Code of Regulations. These regulatory actions are the first comprehensive overhaul of the regulations relating to supervised professional experience (SPE) in the history of the Board of Psychology.

The re-engineering of the regulations relating to the SPE requirements (section 1387 of the CA Code of Regulations) which must be met in order to become a licensed psychologist in California has been a long process spanning a period of over five years. The process involved the gathering of research, observation of national trends, deliberations at public board meetings, and input from interns, supervisors and training program directors alike. The proposed regulations attempt to address the realities of the current state-of-the-art in training individuals to become competent psychologists who are prepared to practice psychology independently with safety to the public.

There are nine significant advances in the new supervision regulations that should result in significantly better training experiences for those aspiring to become licensed psychologists. These nine differences between the old supervision regulations and the new supervision regulations are as follows:

1. Section 1387 now provides a definition of "Supervised Professional Experience." This definition states that:
 - "SPE is defined as an organized program that consists of a planned, structured and administered sequence of professionally supervised comprehensive training

experiences. SPE shall have a logical training sequence that builds upon the skills and competencies of trainees to prepare them for the independent practice of psychology.

- SPE shall include socialization into the profession of psychology and shall be augmented by integrated modalities including mentoring, didactic exposure, role-modeling, enactment, observations/vicarious learning, and consultative guidance.
 - SPE shall include activities which address the application of psychological concepts and current and evolving scientific knowledge, principles, and theories to the professional delivery of psychological services to the consumer public."
2. "Internship" is now clearly defined in section 1387 as meaning: "... a placement which is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) or which is a member of or meets the membership requirements of the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) or which is a member of or meets the membership requirements of the California Psychology Internship Council (CAPIC)."

As a reminder, a person accruing hours of SPE as part of an internship as defined, must be performing the limited psychological functions under supervision as part of the internship component of his/her doctoral program pursuant to section 2911 of the Business and Professions Code.

(Continued on page 4)

**Online verification of licensure is now available
on the Board of Psychology's Web site.**

Log on to www.dca.ca.gov/psych



Watch Out for the "Third Man Death"

By A. Steven Frankel, Ph.D., J.D.

The board is pleased to include the following article written by A. Steven Frankel, Ph.D., J.D. Dr. Frankel is a past Director of Clinical Training —currently a Clinical Professor — at the University of Southern California. He is an adjunct professor of law at Loyola and Golden Gate Law Schools and practices both law and psychology in Torrance California.

About 15 years ago, I visited a friend in the East African country of Malawi. As we walked through the bush one morning, he cautioned me about a poisonous snake nicknamed "third man death" because a first passerby would awaken it, the second would irritate it, and the third would be bitten and killed by it. So it is with the provision of psychological services on the Internet.

As a clinician, the idea of serving populations that are, through location, disability or other circumstances, unable to avail themselves of face-to-face services, is truly exciting. It's exciting that the technology is, for the most part, in place and relatively easy to master. My excitement wanes quickly, however, when I consider the attendant risks, especially for patients with dissociative disorders.

Currently, the Internet can be used to provide "telehealth" ("the use of telecommunications and information technology to provide access to health assessment, intervention. Consultation, supervision, education and information across a distance"¹) services in any of several ways. Most simply, e-mail serves as a means of Internet communication, but information Web sites, chat rooms and video conferencing are also available.

Since I am bound by the ethical principles of psychologists and by state and federal law for all professional services I provide, I won't use e-mail to provide services unless ALL of the following provisions are met: 1) I have an existing professional relationship with the patient; 2) I have provided the patient with informed consent about the use of e-mail and its attendant confidentiality

problems; and 3) the e-mail exchange is limited to the provision of information (e.g. "when's my next appointment?" or "what was that reference you mentioned the last time I saw you?").

First, it has become increasingly clear that there is no reasonable expectation of confidentiality for e-mail. Since confidentiality is a critical issue for professional relationships, I won't ever use e-mail without a clear agreement about the limits of confidentiality for e-mail. Also, since confidentiality is a critical issue for professional relationships, I won't ever use e-mail without a clear agreement about the limits of confidentiality. The same applies to cellular and cordless phones. And even if a patient signs an agreement, I can tell you as an attorney that, if bad things happen, I'd rather not have to defend asking patients to sign away highly valued rights, like the right to privacy, just so I can work with them on the Internet.

Second, the rules and regulations that govern all professional contacts require that records be kept of each contact. These records must be protected and they must be accessible to patients - requirements that not only raise problems of security and confidentiality, but also raise issues about the difference between the type of information available with electronic records vs. the kinds of records I keep for patients I see face-to-face. Specifically, the paper records I keep contain notes after each session that meet legal and professional requirements, such that another professional (or a lawyer) could understand what is happening. Electronic records, however, contain the



... I can tell you as an attorney that, if bad things happen, I'd rather not have to defend asking patients to sign away highly valued rights, like the right to privacy. ...



totality of the contact, providing substantially more information than any professional or legal body requires. Patients would have to be appraised of this difference and agree to it — in writing. This requirement is likely to involve snail mail exchanges.

Third, I want to be certain that my professional liability policy covers Internet services. And I want it in writing! With no clear standards of care for Internet services (see below) and almost no empirical research as yet, I want to know that I'm protected in case there's some sort of a problem. When I call my carrier, they tell me that I'm covered for all the services I provide as a professional, but when I press them about Internet applications, their responses are a bit less clear.

(Continued on page 3)



Watch Out ...

(Continued from page 2)

Fourth, I am only licensed to practice in California. While many states allow for limited practice by licensees of other states, some do not. If the patient is out of my jurisdiction, I would either have to know what the laws of their location say about these matters or take a chance on being in violation of local state law. (As an aside, it may be that the technology, which is way ahead of the law in the area, will provide the much-needed national approach to licensure — but it hasn't yet.)

Fifth, I need to communicate to patients that, despite surveys that do indicate patient satisfaction with Internet services that is similar to face-to-face services, there are precious few data bearing on other measures of effectiveness. And I need to document that I have communicated this matter as part of informed consent. I'll also need to clarify what to do in the event of equipment failure, what to do at time when I am not accessible by Internet, and a host of other housekeeping matters that are typically covered in informed consent.

Sixth — especially with e-mail and especially with patients I don't know very well — the absence of video and audio channels makes it almost impossible for me to work with people with dissociative disorders. Without the capacity to carefully observe them during contact, I won't have access to the cues for stress, for switching, etc. I also can't be sure about how they will understand the meaning for my words if they cannot have visual and auditory contact with me, as there is so much data that passes by visual and auditory channels. (While colleagues that are without sight do provide services to dissociative patients, I do not have their expertise in compensatory uses of other channels for data collection and processing.) Even if all

other issues I have listed above became moot, this last issue is enough to keep me from even considering e-mail as a viable treatment modality for dissociative patients.

Seventh, while some of the concerns I have listed above apply less to video-conferencing (especially where the resolution is sufficient for me to see and hear approximately as well as I might in face-to-face contacts), I don't think that any mental health profession is even close to a standard of care for the provision of telehealth services at this time, much less for dissociative patients in particular. So, if something untoward developed and I were hauled into a civil or administrative proceeding, the other side would undoubtedly find "experts" with outstanding credentials who would say that my use of the Internet was highly experimental and perhaps even reckless. I don't want to be there, thank you very much.

If you take the time and effort to do some research on these matters (and if you wish to use the Internet for service provision, you'd better), I think you'll agree with what many of the leading telehealth experts, including Dr. Marlene Maheu² have said so clearly. They foresee

a series of lawsuits involving Internet service providers, resulting in clarification of the standard of care for us all. Thus, we are all caught in a situation where we don't want to be left behind as technology advances, but we also don't want to be so far in the forefront that we are among the parties in the lawsuits that establish the standards of care.

In sum, they're writing songs of Internet services, but not for me. For you, watch out for the third man death!

Footnotes

* The International Society for the Study of Dissociation Newsletter (In Press).

1 Nickelson, D.W. (1998) Telehealth and the evolving health care system: strategic opportunities for professional psychology. *Professional psychology, research and practice*, 29, 527-535.

2 Maheu, M. (1999). Risk management in the re-tooling of health care, Behavioral Information Tomorrow Conference, San Jose. See her Web site at www.telehealth.net. It's the best place to start becoming familiar with relevant issues, problems and resources. ♦

Did you know?

Section 2936 of the California Business and Professions Code states that to facilitate consumers in receiving appropriate psychological services, all licensees and registrants shall be required to post, in a conspicuous location, a notice which reads as follows:

NOTICE: The Department of Consumer Affairs receives questions and complaints regarding the practice of psychology. If you have any questions or complaints, you may contact this department by calling (800) 633-2322 or (916) 263-2699 or by writing to the following address:

Board of Psychology
1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22
Sacramento CA 95825



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 1)

3. Section 1387 is now organized in a manner that makes the regulations much more understandable to those trainees and supervisors that are affected by them. After defining and spelling out the SPE requirements both predoctorally and postdoctorally, the new regulations clearly spell out the ***qualifications and responsibilities of primary supervisors*** followed by the ***qualifications and responsibilities of delegated supervisors***. The next major section in the new regulations focuses on ***SPE for trainees preparing for practice in non-mental health delivery services***. The new regulations clearly describe ***how SPE can be accrued in other jurisdictions and qualify for meeting California requirements***. Finally, the new regulations clearly describe the ***SPE log*** that every trainee must keep and maintain.
 4. The new regulations do not require the primary supervisor to be “on site” 50 percent of the time that the trainee is performing services, as has historically been the case. The new regulations instead require the primary supervisor to be “employed in the same work setting at least half the time as the supervisee and be available to the supervisee 100% of the time the supervisee is accruing SPE.” This acknowledges new technologies (cell phones, pagers, etc.) that make such availability feasible and convenient and which will in turn result in more valuable training experiences and placements.
 5. The new regulations no longer require supervisors to have three years of post-licensure experience in order to supervise. Instead, the new regulations require supervisors to certify on the form on which SPE is verified that they are qualified to supervise based upon completion of six hours of formal training in supervision. This training can be accrued in one or more of the following ways:
 - “Supervision of supervision” training during internship;
 - Formal coursework in supervision of psychology trainees taken from an accredited educational institution;
 - Workshops in supervision of psychology trainees;
 - Supervision training received as part of grand rounds; or
 - Other experiences which provide direction and education in the principles of supervision of psychology trainees.
 6. The new regulations will no longer limit to 1500 the number of hours that can be accrued under a single supervisor.
 7. The new regulations will require, in most cases, that the primary supervisor must be a licensed psychologist. No longer will MFT’s and LCSW’s be able to serve as the primary supervisor in certain settings. However, they will still be able to serve as a delegated supervisor (which is overseen by the primary supervisor). The one exception to this amendment is in the case of a psychological assistant who is registered to a Board Certified psychiatrist. In this case, the Board Certified psychiatrist can be the primary supervisor for up to 750 hours of qualifying experience.
 8. New section 1387 does NOT affect the manner in which psychological assistants must be supervised. This is one “exception” that is repeatedly pointed out in the regulations. Supervision of psychological assistants will still need to comply with section 1391 of the Code of Regulations. Supervisors of psychological assistants still need to be physically on site at the same time as the psychological assistant is working. Whether or not hours are being accrued to meet licensing requirements, all mandates of section 1391 still need to be met and will still be enforced with respect to psychological assistant registrations. Again, the changes made to section 1387 do not affect the manner in which a psychological assistant must be supervised.
 9. The new regulations will require each supervisor to provide each supervisee with the pamphlet *Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex*.
- It is important to point out that although many changes have occurred in the SPE regulations, many requirements remain the same. For example, one still needs to accrue 3000 hours to meet licensing requirements and at least 1500 of these hours must be accrued postdoctorally. One still needs to ensure that the SPE is legally being accrued pursuant to either section 2909(d), 2910, 2911, or 2913 of the Business and Professions Code. Another example would be that one still needs to be provided 10 percent supervision and the primary supervisor must still provide at least one hour per week of direct, individual, face-to-face supervision.
- The new SPE regulations will help to ensure that the training experience of potential psychologists is the best possible to prepare one for the independent practice of psychology. The new regulations are less burdensome and far more understandable to the supervisors as well as to those who are being supervised. Now that the new regula-

(Continued on page 5)



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 4)

tions have received final approval from the Office of Administrative Law, they will go into effect January 1, 2001. In the meantime, as we transition to the new regulations, the Board will monitor the effectiveness of the regulations by inviting feedback from the supervisors and supervisees who must comply with the regulations. Constructive feedback will be helpful in making the SPE regulations as meaningful and as effective as they possibly can be and will assist in making subsequent amendments as the Board strives to perfect the regulations.

Following is the text of the new regulations as approved by the Office of Administrative Law:

1387 Supervised Professional Experience

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001. Any supervised professional experience (SPE) accrued on or after January 1, 2001, must comply with the following criteria:

SPE is defined as an organized program that consists of a planned, structured and administered sequence of professionally supervised comprehensive training experiences. SPE shall have a logical training sequence that builds upon the skills and competencies of trainees to prepare them for the independent practice of psychology.

SPE shall include socialization into the profession of psychology and shall be augmented by integrated modalities including mentoring, didactic exposure, role-modeling, enactment, observational/ vicarious learning, and consultative guidance.

SPE shall include activities which address the application of psychological concepts and current and evolving scientific knowledge, principles, and theories to the professional delivery of psychological services to the consumer public. The term "formal internship" as used in these regulations means a placement which is accredited by the American Psychological Association (APA) or which is a member of or meets the membership requirements of the Association of Psychology Postdoctoral and Internship Centers (APPIC) or which is a member of or meets the membership requirements of the California Psychology Internship Council (CAPIC).

- (a) Pursuant to section 2914 (c) of the code, two years of qualifying SPE shall be completed and documented prior to licensure. One year of SPE shall be defined as 1500 hours. At least one year of SPE shall be completed postdoctorally. Each year of SPE shall be completed within a thirty (30) con-

secutive month period. If both years of SPE (3000 hours) are completed postdoctorally, they shall be completed within a sixty (60) month period.

- (1) Predoctoral SPE: Up to 1500 hours of SPE may be accrued predoctorally but only after completion of 48 semester/trimester or 72 quarter units of graduate coursework in psychology not including thesis, internship or dissertation. Predoctoral SPE may be accrued only as follows:

- (A) In a formal internship placement pursuant to section 2911 of the code; or
(B) As an employee of an exempt setting pursuant to section 2910 of the code; or
(C) As a psychological assistant pursuant to section 2913 of the code.

- (2) Postdoctoral SPE: At least 1500 hours of SPE shall be accrued postdoctorally. "Postdoctorally" means after the date certified as "meeting all the requirements for the doctoral degree" by the Registrar or Dean of the educational institution, or by the Director of Training of the doctoral program. Postdoctoral SPE may be accrued only as follows:

- (A) As a registered psychologist pursuant to section 2909(d) of the code; or
(B) As an employee of an exempt setting pursuant to section 2910 of the code; or
(C) As a psychological assistant pursuant to section 2913 of the code.

(b) Supervision Requirements:

- (1) Primary supervisors shall meet the requirements set forth in section 1387.1.
(2) Delegated supervisors shall meet the requirements set forth in section 1387.2.
(3) Supervisees shall have no proprietary interest in the business of the primary or delegated supervisor(s) and shall not serve in any capacity which would hold influence over the primary or delegated supervisor(s)' judgment in providing supervision.
(4) Supervisees shall be provided with supervision for 10% of the total time worked each week. At least one hour per week shall be

(Continued on page 6)



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 5)

face-to-face, direct, individual supervision with the primary supervisor.

- (5) A maximum of forty four (44) hours per week will be credited toward meeting the SPE requirement. This shall include the required 10% supervision.
- (6) The primary supervisor shall be employed in the same work setting at least half the time as the supervisee and be available to the supervisee 100% of the time the supervisee is accruing SPE. This availability may be in-person, by telephone, by pager or other appropriate technology. This subparagraph does not apply to psychological assistants, who are governed by subsection (d) of this section.
- (7) SPE shall not be obtained from supervisors who have received payment, monetary or otherwise, from the supervisee for the purpose of providing such supervision.
- (8) SPE gained while the supervisee is functioning in any other professional capacity under another license or credential, shall not be credited toward meeting the requirements for the psychologist's license.
- (9) SPE shall be verified in writing by the primary supervisor under penalty of perjury. When verifying hours of SPE, both primary and delegated supervisors shall make the qualification certification required in sections 1387.1(b) and section 1387.2(b). When verifying hours of SPE, the primary supervisor shall certify under penalty of perjury that all requirements of this section have been met. The supervisor's written verification of SPE shall be sent directly to the board by the primary supervisor.

(c) Delegated Supervision Requirements:

- (1) Except as provided in 1387(d), which governs the supervision of psychological assistants, primary supervisors may delegate supervision to other qualified licensed psychologists or to other qualified mental health professionals including licensed marriage and family therapists, licensed educational psychologists, licensed clinical social workers and board certified psychiatrists.

(2) The primary supervisor remains responsible for providing the minimum one hour per week of direct, individual face-to-face supervision.

(3) The primary supervisor remains responsible for ensuring compliance with this section.

(d) Exceptions Governing Psychological Assistants:

(1) Psychological assistants shall be in compliance with the psychological assistant regulations commencing with section 1391 CCR and shall meet the following criteria:

(A) The supervisor shall be physically on site at least 50% of the time that the registered psychological assistant is working each week and shall be available at all other times the supervisee is accruing SPE by telephone, pager or other appropriate technology.

(B) The supervisor shall provide supervision each week for no less than 10% of the hours worked by the supervisee. This shall include at least one hour of direct, individual, face-to-face supervision.

(C) A maximum of 750 hours out of the 3000 required hours of SPE may be accrued as a psychological assistant registered under the supervision of a board certified psychiatrist. The remaining 2250 hours must be accrued under the primary supervision of a qualified psychologist.

(2) A registered psychological assistant employed by one of the organizations specified in section 2913 of the code may receive delegated supervision pursuant to section 1387(c) from a qualified psychologist or a board certified psychiatrist other than the supervisor to whom s/he is registered if the delegated supervisor is also employed within the same organization. Otherwise, supervision may not be delegated under a psychological assistant registration.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2914, Business and Professions Code.

(Continued on page 7)



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 6)

1387.1 Qualifications and Responsibilities of Primary Supervisors

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001.

All primary supervisors shall be licensed psychologists, except that board certified psychiatrists may be primary supervisors of their own registered psychological assistants.

- (a) Primary supervisors shall possess and maintain a valid, active license free of any formal disciplinary action, and shall immediately notify the supervisee of any disciplinary action, including revocation, surrender, suspension, probation terms, or changes in licensure status including inactive license, delinquent license or any other license status change that affects the primary supervisor's ability or qualifications to supervise.
- (b) Primary supervisors shall certify under penalty of perjury on the verification form referenced in section 1387(b)(9) that they are qualified to supervise psychology trainees pursuant to 1387.1(a) and that they have completed at least six hours of formal training in supervision. Such training shall include the processes, procedures and theories of supervision needed to prepare trainees for independent practice of psychology with safety to the public. Additionally, such training shall include laws and regulations relating to the practice of psychology. Training pursuant to this section may be obtained in one or more of the following ways:
 - (1) Supervision of supervision training during internship;
 - (2) Formal coursework in supervision of psychology trainees taken from an accredited educational institution.
 - (3) Workshops in supervision of psychology trainees;
 - (4) Supervision training received as part of grand rounds;
 - (5) Other experiences which provide direction and education in the principles of supervision of psychology trainees.
- (c) Primary supervisors shall be in compliance at all times with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, the licensing laws of the Board of Behavioral Sciences, the Medical Practice Act, and the regulations adopted pursuant to these laws.
- (d) Primary supervisors shall be responsible for

ensuring compliance at all times by the supervisee with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, the licensing laws of the Board of Behavioral Sciences, the Medical Practice Act, and the regulations adopted pursuant to these laws.

- (e) Primary supervisors shall be responsible for ensuring that all SPE including record keeping is conducted in compliance with the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association.
- (f) Primary supervisors shall be responsible for monitoring the welfare of the supervisee's clients.
- (g) Primary supervisors shall be responsible for informing each client or patient in writing prior to the rendering of services by the supervisee that the supervisee is unlicensed and is functioning under the direction and supervision of the supervisor and that any fees paid for the services of the supervisee must be paid directly to the primary supervisor or employer.
- (h) Primary supervisors shall be responsible for monitoring the clinical performance and professional development of the supervisee.
- (i) Primary supervisors shall ensure that they have the education, training, and experience in the area(s) of psychological practice they will supervise.
- (j) The primary supervisor shall ensure that the supervisee has education and training in the area(s) of psychological practice to be supervised.
- (k) Primary supervisors shall have no familial, intimate or other relationship with the supervisee which would compromise the supervisor's effectiveness, and/or which would violate the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association.
- (l) Primary supervisors shall not supervise a supervisee who is now or has ever been a psychotherapy client of the supervisor.
- (m) Primary supervisors shall not exploit or engage in sexual relationships, or any other sexual contact with supervisees.
- (n) Primary supervisors shall provide a copy of the pamphlet Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex to each supervisee.
- (o) Primary supervisors shall monitor the supervision performance of all delegated supervisors.

(Continued on page 8)



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 7)

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2914, Business and Professions Code.

1387.2 Qualifications and Responsibilities of Delegated Supervisors

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001.

Delegated supervisors shall be Licensed Psychologists or those other licensed mental health professionals listed in section 1387(c).

- (a) Delegated supervisors shall have and shall maintain a valid, active license free of any formal disciplinary action, shall immediately notify the supervisee and the primary supervisor of any disciplinary action, including revocation, surrender, suspension, probation terms, or changes in licensure status including inactive license, or any other license status change that affects the supervisor's ability or qualifications to supervise.
- (b) Delegated supervisors shall certify under penalty of perjury on the verification form referenced in section 1387(b)(9) that they are qualified to supervise psychology trainees pursuant to section 1387.1(a) and that they have completed six hours of formal training in supervision. Such training shall include the processes, procedures and theories of supervision needed to prepare trainees for independent practice of psychology with safety to the public. Additionally, such training shall include laws and regulations relating to the practice of psychology. Training pursuant to this section may be obtained in one or more of the following ways:
 - (1) Supervision of supervision training during internship;
 - (2) Formal coursework in supervision of psychology trainees taken from an accredited educational institution;
 - (3) Workshops in supervision of psychological trainees;
 - (4) Supervision training received as part of grand rounds;
 - (5) Other experiences which provide direction and education in the principles of supervision of psychology trainees.
- (c) Delegated supervisors shall be in compliance at all times with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, the licensing laws of the Board of Behavioral Sciences, the Medical Practice Act, and the regulations adopted pursuant to these laws.

- (d) Delegated supervisors shall be responsible for ensuring compliance by the supervisee with the provisions of the Psychology Licensing Law, the licensing laws of the Board of Behavioral Sciences, the Medical Practice Act, and the regulations adopted pursuant to these laws.
- (e) Delegated supervisors shall be responsible for ensuring that all SPE and record keeping performed under the supervision delegated to them is conducted in compliance with the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association.
- (f) Delegated supervisors shall be responsible for monitoring the welfare of the supervisee's clients while under their delegated supervision.
- (g) Delegated supervisors shall be responsible for monitoring the clinical performance and professional development of the supervisee and for reporting this performance and development to the primary supervisor.
- (h) Delegated supervisors shall ensure that they have the education, training, and experience in the area(s) of psychological practice to be supervised.
- (i) Delegated supervisors shall have no familial, intimate or other relationship with the supervisee which would compromise the supervisor's effectiveness and/or which would violate the Ethical Principles and Code of Conduct of the American Psychological Association.
- (j) Delegated supervisors shall not supervise a supervisee who is now or has ever been a psychotherapy client of the supervisor.
- (k) Delegated supervisors shall not exploit or engage in sexual relationships, or any other sexual contact with supervisees.

(Continued on page 9)

Did you know?

The BOP Update is mailed to the address of record of all psychological assistants, registered psychologists and licensed psychologists. Additionally, the board mails the BOP Update to all professional and accredited schools with psychology programs in California and to state and local psychological associations.



SPE Regulations Approved ...

(Continued from page 8)

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2914, Business and Professions Code.

1387.3 SPE for Trainees Preparing for Practice in Non-Mental Health Delivery Services

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001.

(a) Due to lack of training sites and qualified supervisors, typically in the area of applied psychological research, industrial-organizational psychology, and social-experimental psychology, but not including those involving direct mental health delivery services, a plan for supervised experience may be submitted by the supervisee to the Board for approval on a case-by-case basis as provided for in section 2914(c) of the code.

(b) For training approved pursuant to this section, the supervisee may be supervised by an appropriate unlicensed individual only if the supervisee has obtained an agreement within the provisions of this section with a licensee who meets the qualifications set forth in section 1387.1, and who is educated and experienced in the supervisee's area of education and training, to serve as co-supervisor. The qualifications and responsibilities of both the supervisor and co-supervisor shall be stated in the letter of agreement for supervision submitted by the supervisee to the board for approval.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2914, Business and Professions Code.

1387.4 Out of State Experience

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001.

(a) SPE accrued in another state, U.S. Territory, or Canadian Province shall meet all of the supervision requirements set forth in sections 1387, 1387.1, 1387.2, 1387.3 (if applicable) and 1387.5 of these regulations. Notwithstanding the requirements of these sections, all out of state SPE must be supervised by a psychologist licensed at the doctoral level in the state, territory or province in which the SPE is taking place or, for no more than 750 hours, by a board certified psychiatrist who is licensed as a physician and surgeon in the state, territory or province in which the SPE is taking place.

(b) SPE can be accrued in countries outside the U.S. or Canada which regulate the profession of psychology pursuant to the same requirements as set forth in section 2914 of the code. SPE accrued in countries outside the U.S., its Territories or Canada must

comply with all the supervision requirements of section 1387. The burden shall be upon the applicant to provide the necessary documentation and translation that the board may require to verify the qualification of the SPE.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2914, Business and Professions Code.

1387.5 SPE Log

This section becomes operative effective January 1, 2001.

(a) The supervisee shall maintain a written weekly log of all hours of SPE earned toward licensure. The log shall contain a weekly accounting of the following information and shall be made available to the board upon request:

(1) The specific work setting in which the SPE took place.

(2) The specific dates for which the log is being completed.

(3) The number of hours worked during the week.

(4) The number of hours of supervision received during the week.

(5) An indication of whether the supervision was direct, individual, face-to-face, group, or other (specifically listing each activity).

(b) This log must also contain the following information:

(1) The supervisee's legibly printed name, signature and date signed.

(2) The primary supervisor's legibly printed name, signature, license type and number, and date signed.

(3) Any delegated supervisors' legibly printed name, license type and number, and date signed.

(4) A description of the psychological duties performed during the period of supervised professional experience.

(5) A statement signed by the primary supervisor attesting to the accuracy of the information.

(c) When SPE is accrued as part of a formal internship, the internship training director shall be authorized to provide all information required in section 1387.5(b). ♦



A Look at the Law ...

OVERVIEW OF PRIVACY, CONFIDENTIALITY, AND TESTIMONIAL PRIVILEGE

- I. Privacy: The right to decide how to live one's own life
 - A. Constitution of the United States (penumbras of amendments to the Constitution)
 - B. Article 1, section 1, of the California Constitution
 - C. Information Practices Act of 1977 (beginning at Civ. Code §1798)
- II. Confidentiality: The client's right to have communications kept within the bounds of the professional relationship
 - A. All health services providers must maintain the confidentiality of all medical information (Confidentiality of Medical Information Act; Civ. Code §56).
 - B. Confidentiality is maintained for all clients in the public mental health system and in public and private psychiatric hospitals (Lanterman-Petris-Short Act; Welf. & Inst. Code §5328).
 - C. Confidentiality is maintained for developmentally disabled individuals (Welf. & Inst. Code §4514).
- III. Testimonial privilege (or simply privilege): The client's right to prevent the mental health professional from revealing confidential communications in a legal proceeding
 - A. Psychotherapists (Evid. Code §§1010, 1014)
 - 1. Psychiatrists
 - 2. Licensed psychologists
 - 3. Licensed clinical social workers
 - 4. Licensed marriage, family, and child counselors
 - 5. State credentialed school psychologists
 - 6. Supervised assistants, interns, trainees, and students engaged in clinical work
 - 7. Registered nurses who possess a master's degree in psychiatric medical health nursing
 - 8. Individuals providing mental health services under Fam. Code §6924 (individuals providing mental health services to a minor, pursuant to the minor's consent)
 - B. Consistent with the value of individual autonomy, privilege belongs to the patient.
 - C. A client is said to "waive privilege" when he or she allows a mental health professional to reveal communications in a court of law, a deposition, or an administrative hearing.
 - D. A client is said to "invoke privilege" when he or she does not allow a mental health professional to reveal communications in a court of law, a deposition, or an administrative hearing.
 - E. If the client is unavailable, the mental health professional should invoke privilege on the client's behalf. ♦

Reprinted from The Essentials of California Mental Health Law, a Straightforward Guide for Clinicians of all Disciplines. © 1998 by Stephen Benke. With permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.



A Look at the Law ...

MANDATORY REPORTING STATUTES

I. Mandated reporting for certain groups:

- A. Children (individuals under the age of 18) (Penal Code §11164)
- B. Elderly (individuals 65 or over) (Welf. & Inst. Code §15610.27)
- C. Dependent adults (individuals between the ages of 18 and 64 with a mental or physical limitation as a result of which they are dependent on others) (Welf. & Inst. Code §15610.23)
- D. Hospital patients who have been transferred from a health or community care facility (Penal Code §11161.8)

II. Conditions for reporting:

A. Children

- 1. Physical injury inflicted by other than accidental means
- 2. Sexual abuse (including sexual assault or sexual exploitation)
- 3. Act or omission that constitutes willful cruelty or unjustifiable punishment
- 4. Neglect
- 5. Physical dependence upon addictive drug at birth

B. Elderly and dependent adults

- 1. Physical abuse (assault, battery, unreasonable restraint, sexual abuse)
- 2. Misuse of physical or chemical restraint
- 3. Neglect, abandonment, or isolation
- 4. Fiduciary abuse (misappropriation of money or property)

C. Patients

- 1. Abuse
- 2. Neglect
- 3. Assaultive injuries (e.g., from a firearm)

Note: Assembly Bill 1241, Statutes of 2000, effective Jan. 1, 2001 changed some of the child abuse reporting requirements. You may access this new law at the Legislative Cosunsel Website at www.leginfo.ca.gov.

III. Standard for reporting: **Know or reasonably suspect** that condition for reporting is present

IV. When reports must be made:

- A. Oral reports (immediately, or as soon as possible)
- B. Written reports
 - 1. Children and patients (within 36 hours)
 - 2. Elderly and dependent adults (within 2 working days)

V. To whom the reports must be made when report involves:

- A. Children (a child protective agency or local law enforcement)
- B. Elderly/dependent adults (long-term care ombudsman, local law enforcement, or county adult protective services)
- C. Patients (local police authority and county health department)

VI. Failure to report: Possible criminal sanctions, civil sanctions, and professional discipline

VII. Release from liability: No civil or criminal sanctions attach when report is made in good faith

VIII. One mandatory reporting statute applies to a condition: disorders characterized by a lapse of consciousness (H. & S. Code, §103900)

- A. Physicians are mandated reporters.
- B. Reports must be made on any individual 14 years of age or older.
- C. Reports must be made “immediately.”
- D. Reports must be made to the local health officer.
- E. Release from liability for making a report pursuant to the statute. ♦

Reprinted from The Essentials of California Mental Health Law, a Straightforward Guide for Clinicians of all Disciplines. © 1998 by Stephen Benke. With permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.



A Look at the Law ...

CONFIDENTIALITY: DISCLOSURES OF INFORMATION

- I. Presume that everything a patient communicates to you is confidential.
- II. If the possibility of disclosing a patient communication arises, consider whether any exception to confidentiality will permit the disclosure.
- III. If the disclosure is to take place in a court of law, a deposition, or an administrative hearing, consider whether any exception to testimonial privilege will permit the disclosure.
- IV. The Law of No Surprises, Parsimony Principle, and professional codes of ethics govern all disclosures of patient communications.
 - A. Law of No Surprises
 1. Inform client at outset that there are limits to confidentiality.
 - a. Give general contours of limits to confidentiality at initial session.
 - b. Tailor what you say to meet needs and circumstances of specific client.
 - c. Emphasize that client will be notified of any disclosures.
 - d. Document your discussion.
 2. Whenever possible, make client part of disclosure process, up to and including having client make the actual disclosure when appropriate.
 3. Consider giving client informed consent letter at first session.
 - B. Parsimony Principle
 1. Determine what information is necessary and sufficient to meet purpose of disclosure.
 2. Disclose only that information.
 - C. Professional codes of ethics
 1. Each major mental health discipline has a code of ethics.
 2. California law allows regulatory bodies to consider codes of ethics when evaluating whether professional misconduct has occurred.
 3. Often, codes of ethics require a more stringent standard of behavior than does the law. ♦

Reprinted from **The Essentials of California Mental Health Law, a Straightforward Guide for Clinicians of all Disciplines.** © 1998 by Stephen Benke. With permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Did you know?

The address of record listed on your BOP Update mailing label is the address of record listed with the Board of Psychology.

This is the address that is given to the public upon request and where your license renewal forms are sent.

It is also the address that is made available to the public on the Board of

Psychology Web site verification-of-license feature.

You may wish to consider not using your residence address as your address of record for reasons of personal security. If you wish to change your address of record, you can either mail the request to the board's office in Sacramento or you can e-mail the request to: bopmail@dca.ca.gov.



A Look at the Law ...

‘TARASOFF’ CASE DECISION GUIDES LAW

California Civil Code §43.92

- I. The duty arising under California Civil Code §43.92 applies to:
 - A. “Psychotherapists” as defined by §1010 of the Evidence Code:
 - 1. Psychiatrists
 - 2. Licensed psychologists
 - 3. Licensed clinical social workers
 - 4. Licensed marriage, family, and child counselors
 - 5. State-credentialed school psychologists
 - 6. Supervised assistants, interns, trainees and students engaged in clinical work
 - 7. Registered nurses who possess a master’s degree in psychiatric mental health nursing
 - 8. Individuals providing mental health services under Family Code §6924 (individuals providing mental health services to a minor, pursuant to the minor’s consent)
 - B. If in doubt, and your clinical work requires a license from the state, consider yourself covered by the statute until you can determine otherwise.
- II. Psychotherapists are not to subject to monetary liability for failing **to warn, to protect, or to predict**, except under the specific circumstance identified in the statute.
- III. The duty is:
 - A. To warn and to protect *and*
 - B. To predict.
- IV. A psychotherapist has a duty to warn, to protect, and to predict **only** when:
 - A. A **patient** has **communicated to the psychotherapist**
 - B. A **serious** threat of **physical violence**
 - C. Against a **reasonably identifiable** victim or victims.
- V. A psychotherapist fulfills the duty under the statute by making **reasonable** efforts to communicate the threat:
 - A. to the victim or victims *and*
 - B. to the police. ♦

Reprinted from The Essentials of California Mental Health Law, a Straightforward Guide for Clinicians of all Disciplines. © 1998 by Stephen Benke. With permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.



A Look at the Law ...

RECEIVING A SUBPOENA

I. What **not** to do:

- A. Do not attempt to avoid service (that is, don't attempt to avoid receiving the subpoena itself).
- B. Do not disclose **any** information (or release **any** records) protected by testimonial privilege.
- C. Do not contact the attorney who issued the subpoena (except to ask that you be released from the subpoena).

II. What to do:

- A. Contact your client and indicate that you have received a subpoena.
- B. Find out whether your client wishes to **waive** or **invoke** privilege.
 - 1. If client **waives** privilege
 - a. Get waiver in writing.
 - b. You may now disclose client information in the legal proceeding.
 - 2. If client **invokes** privilege
 - a. Ask to be released from the subpoena.
 - b. If not released from the subpoena, you must comply with the subpoena by appearing at the specified time and place.
 - c. If the subpoena is a subpoena duces tecum, you will take the physical documents requested with you to the legal proceeding.
 - d. At the proceeding you will state that your client has invoked privilege. You will not say anything else, and you will keep your arms tightly wrapped around the physical documents.
 - e. The judge will determine whether you must disclose client information. The judge will issue an order telling you what to do.

III. If you are unsure of what to do (e.g., because you cannot find your client), invoke privilege.

- A. The question of whether you must testify or release records will go before a judge.
- B. The judge will determine whether the material is "protected by privilege."
- C. If the judge decides that the material is protected by privilege, he will "quash" (squash) the subpoena.
- D. If the judge decides that the material is not protected by privilege, or that the material falls under an exception to privilege he will issue an order.
- E. Follow the judge's order exactly.

Reprinted from The Essentials of California Mental Health Law, a Straightforward Guide for Clinicians of all Disciplines. © 1998 by Stephen Benke. With permission of the publisher, W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.



Board Member Update

At its May 2000 Quarterly Board Meeting in Riverside, the Board of Psychology elected Martin Greenberg, Ph.D. as its President for the upcoming year. Dr. Greenberg succeeds Judith Fabian, Ph.D., who nominated him for the position and who served as the Board's President for the past two years. Emil Rodolfa, Ph.D. was elected to serve as the board's Vice-President.

During the President's Report at the Board's August 2000 Quarterly Meeting in Sacramento, Dr. Greenberg announced board member assignments to the various committees of the board. The committee assignments for the 2000-2001 year are as follows:

Committee	Chairperson	Members
Credentials Committee	Dr. Pamela Harmell	Dr. Emil Rodolfa and Lisa Kalustian
Examination Committee	Dr. Emil Rodolfa	Dr. Pamela Harmell, Dr. Judith Fabian and Mary Ellen Early
Enforcement Committee	Mary McMillan	Dr. Emil Rodolfa and Dr. Judith Fabian
Legislation Committee	Mary Ellen Early	Marilyn Palarea and Lisa Kalustian
Consumer Education Committee	Lisa Kalustian	Dr. Pamela Harmell and Mary Ellen Early
Personnel Committee	Marilyn Palarea	Mary McMillan and Mary Ellen Early
Continuing Education Committee	Dr. Emil Rodolfa	Thomas O'Connor and Mary McMillan

Important Reminder Regarding Psychological Assistants

Psychological assistants need to be aware that if their supervisor's license becomes delinquent at any time during the registration period, none of the supervised professional experience hours earned during the period of delinquency will be counted toward meeting licensure requirement.

The Board of Psychology strongly recommends that psychological assistants:

(1) know the expiration date of their supervisor's license and remind him/her to renew before its expiration date, and

(2) check with their supervisor prior to the annual Jan. 31 expiration of their psychological assistant registration to make sure that renewal fees were paid.

It is the responsibility of the supervisor/employer to pay the application and renewal fees.

Both of these precautions will help to ensure that all of the psychological assistant's hours of supervised professional experience will be accepted toward meeting licensure requirements.

Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology

For senior psychologists, the easiest route to obtain the Certificate of Professional Qualification in Psychology (CPQ) ends December 31, 2000.

The CPQ is the mobility credential issued by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (ASPPB) that makes it easier for psychologists to be licensed in multiple states, provinces and territories.

The current "grandparenting" provision of the CPQ may apply to licensed psychologists who: were licensed at the doctoral level in 1981 or before in the U.S. or in 1986 or before in

Canada; who have a current license; and who have had no disciplinary actions that have been taken against the license. Before this "grandparenting" period ends, take a look at what the CPQ is and what it can do for you.

The CPQ provides qualified psychologists a credential that simplifies the licensing process.

Already, 12 states and provinces accept the CPQ, and at least 8 more are working to modify their laws and regulations to recognize it. Time is running out to be grandfathered into the CPQ certificate.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Certification is not limited to senior psychologists. To find out how you might qualify, visit the ASPPB Web site at www.asppb.org.

- Special provisions for obtaining the CPQ apply to persons who hold an ABPP diploma or who are listed in the National Register (NR) or Canadian Register (CR) of Health Service Providers. For NR and CR individuals, these special provisions end December 31, 2001.

- If you already hold a CPQ, check the ASPPB Web site for an up-to-date listing of boards that accept the CPQ. ♦



Disciplinary Actions

FEBRUARY 1, 2000 — SEPTEMBER 30, 2000

NOTICE: The following decisions become operative on the effective date except in situations where the licensee obtains a court-ordered stay. This may occur after the preparation of this newsletter. For updated information on stay orders and appeals you may telephone (916) 263-2691 and speak to the Board's Enforcement Technician. To order copies of these decisions and other documents, send your written request by mail or e-mail at bopmail@dca.ca.gov. Include the name and license number of the licensee and send to the attention of the Enforcement Program at the Board's offices in Sacramento. Please note that there is a minimal copying charge for these documents.

Adams, Richard L., Ph.D. (PSY 10027)
Fresno, CA

B&P Code §2960(j). Being grossly negligent in the practice of his or her profession. Revoked, stayed, 3 years probation.

Ammon, Barbara, Ph.D. (PSY 11667)
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

B&P Code §2960(h). Willful, unauthorized communication of information received in professional confidence. Stipulated Decision effective February 3, 2000. Revoked, stayed, 2 years probation.

Barr, Larry L., Ph.D. (PSY 22)
Santa Fe, NM

Stipulated Decision effective June 16, 2000. License surrender.

Brown, Stephen Woody, Ph.D. (PSY 3412)
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

B&P Code §2960. Unprofessional conduct. Decision effective March 19, 2000. Revoked, stayed, 5 years probation.

Chorjel, Candace, Ph.D. (PSY 9662)
Boulder Creek, CA

Neither admits or denies charges of B&P Code 2960(c)(j)(n). Fraudulently or neglectfully misrepresenting the type or status of license or registration actually held. Being grossly negligent in the practice of his or her profession. The commission of any dishonest, corrupt, or fraudulent act. Stipulated Decision effective August 20, 2000. License revoked, stayed, 3 years probation.

Chorjel, David Leon (PSB 12618)
Boulder Creek, CA

Stipulated Decision effective June 19, 2000. Registration surrender.

Collins, Sue (PSY 14475)
Chatsworth, CA

Stipulated Decision effective August 16, 2000. License surrender.

Headington, Bonnie J., Ph.D. (PSY 4403)
Houston, TX

B&P Code 2960(m). Disciplinary action by another state against a license or registration. Stipulated Decision effective September 29, 2000. Public reprimand.

Lille, Jeffrey Jay, Ph.D. (PSY 9831)
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

B&P Codes §§2960(b)(j). Use of a controlled substance. Being grossly negligent in the practice of his or her profession. Stipulated Decision effective February 20, 2000. Revoked, stayed, 180 day suspension, 5 years probation.

Post, David Lawrence, Ph.D. (PSY 7886)
San Ramon, CA

Stipulated Decision effective July 8, 2000. License surrender.

Powell, Laurie (PSY 9890)
Los Angeles, CA

Stipulated Decision effective August 18, 2000. License surrender.

Explanation of Disciplinary Language

Revoked—The license is cancelled, voided, annulled, rescinded. The right to practice is ended.

Revoked, stayed, probation—“Stayed” means the revocation is postponed, put off. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.

Suspension—The licensee is prohibited from practicing for a specific period of time.

Gross negligence—An extreme departure from the standard of practice.

Default decision—Licensee fails to respond to Accusation by filing a Notice of Defense, or fails to appear at administrative hearing.

License surrender—Resignation “under a cloud.” While charges are still pending, the licensee turns in the license - subject to acceptance by the board. The right to practice is ended.

Effective decision date—The date the disciplinary decision goes into operation.

Ransom, Robert S., Ph.D. (PSY 3702)
San Clemente, CA 92673

B&P Code §2960(a). Unprofessional conduct. Conviction of a crime substantially related to the qualifications, functions or duties of a psychologist. Decision effective April 29, 2000. License revoked.

(Continued on page 17)



New Statute Of Limitations

Section 2960.05 was added to the Business and Professions Code effective January 1, 2000.

This statute requires the board to file an accusation within three years from the date the board discovers the alleged act or omission that is the basis for license discipline, or within seven years from the date the alleged act or omissions that is the basis for license discipline occurred, whichever is first.

This new statute also states that accusations filed against licensees that allege the procurement of a license by fraud or misrepresentation are not subject to the limitations of section 2960.05.

Finally, this statute of limitations states that if an alleged act or omission involves a minor, the seven-year limitations period is tolled until the minor reaches the age of majority.

To review the actual language of this new statute of limitations, you can link to the Business and Professions Code from the Board of Psychology Web site at www.dca.ca.gov/psych. ♦

Disciplinary Actions ...

(Continued from page 16)

**Roberts, Terrence J., Ph.D. (PSY 8892)
Pasadena, CA 91102**

B&P Code §§2960(i)(k). Violating any rule of professional conduct promulgated by the Board and set forth in regulations duly adopted under this chapter. Violating any of the provisions of this chapter or regulations duly adopted thereunder. Stipulated Decision effective May 17, 2000. Revoked, Stayed, 5 years probation.

**Young, Patricia A., Ph.D. (PSY 15394)
Sherman Oaks, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective September 27, 2000. License surrender. ♦

Qualified Experts Needed for Review of Psychology Board Enforcement Cases

In 1994, the California Board of Psychology formalized its expert case reviewer program to create a systematic and objective approach to the Board's enforcement case review process. Experts assist the Board in protecting consumers by providing expert reviews, opinions and testimony on Board enforcement cases and by conducting psychological examinations on respondents when ordered by the board.

The Board's Expert Reviewer Program is looking for psychologists who are interested in providing such services to the Board. The requirements for qualifying to be a Board expert include: possession of a current and valid psychologist license, licensed at least three years with no prior license discipline, currently practicing psychology, possession of a doctorate degree in psychology from an accredited university, and forensic experience. Publications in professional journals and experience in peer review and ethics committee work is also valuable experience for this purpose.

Experts are compensated at the rate of \$75/hour for time conducting case reviews and \$100/hour for time providing consultation with the Attorney General's Office and for expert testimony at administrative hearings. Experts are reimbursed for travel expenses within limits imposed by the State Administrative Manual. The rates are different for conducting psychological evaluations.

All newly approved Board experts are provided with a training manual that explains the program and the review process. This tool assists the expert in preparing an expert report as part of a case review. The total time required to review the binder materials should be no more than six hours. Additionally, all Board experts must participate in the Board's annual expert training.

If you are interested in serving as an expert for the Board, please request the expert application packet either by e-mailing your request to: Kathi_Burns@dca.ca.gov or by writing to:

Board of Psychology
1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22
Sacramento, CA 95825-3200 ♦

HMO Consumer Complaint Hotline

In the interest of consumer protection, the Board of Psychology enthusiastically supports the Consumer Complaint Hotline of the Department of Corporations. The Board encourages all licensees to post the hotline number in their offices so that HMO patients are aware of the recourse they may have in dealing with their managed care insurance carrier.

The hotline number is:
1-800-400-0815

A formal complaint may be filed with the Department of Corporations after a patient has attempted all available remedies within the HMO grievance system.

HMO personnel who are licensed psychologists must adhere to all ethical principles applicable to the profession, as well as all laws relating to psychology licensure. ♦



Assembly Bill 400

On September 26, 2000, Governor Davis signed Assembly Bill 400 which was authored by Assemblyman Ted Lempert.

This bill was sponsored by the California Psychological Association and it was supported by the Board of Psychology. This bill becomes effective January 1, 2001 and it will:

1. Require applicants for licensure to possess a doctorate degree in psychology, educational psychology, or in education with the field of specialization in counseling psychology or educational psychology. No longer will the board review degrees not in these areas to determine "equivalency" or "comparability."

2. Require applicants for licensure to possess the appropriate degree obtained from a regionally accredited university. No longer will the board be required to accept psychology degrees from unaccredited universities except for those psychology degrees that were obtained from a school that was "approved" by the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education on or before July 1, 1999. Additionally this bill will require that such "approved" schools have not, since July 1, 1999 had a new location and that such schools are not a franchise institution as defined in section 94729.3 of the Education Code.

3. Requires all "approved" schools meeting the above criteria to provide to each prospective student a "Unaccredited Graduate Psychology School Disclosure Form" that discloses the following:

- The number of graduates of the school who have taken the

written and oral psychology licensing examinations in the preceding four years;

- The number of graduates of the school who have passed the written and oral psychology licensing examinations in the preceding four years;

- The number of graduates who have become licensed California psychologists in the preceding four years;

- A disclosure statement in 14-point boldface type that reads as follows:

"Prospective students should be aware that as a graduate of an unaccredited school of psychology you may face restrictions that could include difficulty in obtaining a teaching job or appointment at an accredited college or university. It may also be difficult to work as a psychologist for some federal government or other public agencies, or to be appointed to the medical staff of a hospital. Some major managed care organizations, insurance companies, or preferred provider organizations may not reimburse individuals whose degrees are from unaccredited schools. Graduates of unaccredited schools may also face limitations in their abilities to be listed in the National Register of Health Service Providers or to hold memberships in other major organizations of psychologists."

The actual language of the bill can be reviewed online at www.leginfo.ca.gov.

For Your Information

We've Got Mail

You can e-mail the Board with any question, comment or suggestion at: bopmail@dca.ca.gov. Additionally, you can change your address of record by simply e-mailing the board.

It is the Board's goal to respond to e-mails within one working day after receipt.

Supervisors of Psychological Assistants Take Note

Every supervisor of a psychological assistant shall be responsible for the limited psychological functions performed by the psychological assistant and for ensuring that the extent, kind and quality of the limited psychological functions performed by the assistant are consistent with his or her training and experience.

The supervisor must also ensure that the assistant complies with the provisions of the code and the Board's regulations. (1391.6(a) California Code of Regulations)

The supervisor of a psychological assistant shall inform each client or patient in writing prior to the rendering of services by the psychological assistant that the assistant is unlicensed and is under the direction and supervision of the supervisor as an employee. (1391.6(b) California Code of Regulations)

Display Psychology License

Section 1380.6 of the California Code of Regulations requires every licensed psychologist to display his or her psychology licensing number in any advertising, public directory or solicitation. This would include business cards, letterhead, business directories, etc.

Commissioners Earn Credit

Licensees may earn four hours of approved continuing education by serving a full day as an oral commissioner at the Board's oral licensing examination? Contact Lavinia Snyder, the Board's Examination Coordinator, at the Board's mailing address or by e-mail at Lavinia_Snyder@dca.ca.gov.

Find Us Online

The Board's Web site at www.dca.ca.gov/psych contains all issues of the *BOP Update* and other publications, such as the pamphlet, *Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex*. The "What's New" section of the Web site is where the Board posts notices of regulation changes, new legislation and other vital information to keep licensees, registrants, applicants and consumers up to date.



April 2000 Written Examination Results by School

School Name	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
American Behavioral Studies Institute	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Antioch New England Grad School	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Azusa Pacific University, Azusa	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Boston University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Brigham Young University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Baylor University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Biola University, La Mirada	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Brusov State Teacher Training	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
California Graduate School of Psychology	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
California Coast University	5	1	20.00	4	80.00
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	14	5	35.71	9	64.29
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, S.F.	4	4	100.00	0	00.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	33	19	57.58	14	42.42
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	27	17	62.96	10	37.04
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	77	48	62.34	29	37.66
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	24	21	87.50	3	12.50
California State University, Sacramento	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	4	0	00.00	4	100.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Chicago School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
College of Notre Dame, Belmont	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Colorado State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Depaul University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	8	4	50.00	4	50.00
Gallaudet University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Graduate Center For Child Development & Psychotherapy	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Illiois Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Immaculata College	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Institute Of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
International College, Los Angeles	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Long Island University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New School University, New York	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Oklahoma State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-Of-Country	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-Of-State	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pepperdine University	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Purdue University, Calumet	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pacific Graduate School Of Psychology, Palo Alto	13	12	92.31	1	07.69
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	6	3	50.00	3	50.00

(Continued on page 20)



April 2000 Written Examination Results by School

(Continued from page 19)

School Name	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Pepperdine University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Professional School Of Psychology	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Rosemead School Of Psychology, La Mirada	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	12	6	50.00	6	50.00
Stanford University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Saybrook Institute, San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
State University Of New York, Buffalo	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
The San Francisco School Of Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
UC, Berkeley	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Los Angeles	7	5	71.43	2	28.57
UC, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC, Santa Barbara	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Union Institute	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
University of Arizona	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Georgia	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Kentucky	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Missouri, Columbia	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Pittsburgh	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Texas, Austin	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Wisconsin, Milwaukee	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Union Graduate School	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Union Institute	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	16	6	37.50	10	62.50
University For Humanistic Studies, San Diego	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	5	3	60.00	2	40.00
University of Southern Mississippi	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Toronto	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Washington	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Wisconsin - Madison	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of The Pacific, Stockton	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Virginia Commonwealth University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Walden University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Washington State University	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Western American University	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
Western Graduate School Of Psychology, Palo Alto	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Wheaton College, Mass.	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wheaton College, Mass.	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
Wright Institute, Berkeley	13	8	61.54	5	38.46
Yeshiva University - Bronx, NY	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Grand Total	395	232	58.73	163	41.27



June 2000 Oral Examination Results by School*

School Name	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Adelphi University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Arizona State University	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
American Behavioral Studies Institute	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Boston University	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Ball State Univeristy	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Baylor University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Biola University, La Mirada	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
California Graduate School of Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Case Western Reserve University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angelest	20	8	40.00	12	60.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, S.F.	8	4	50.00	4	50.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	54	28	51.85	26	48.15
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	37	15	40.54	22	59.46
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	79	30	37.97	49	62.03
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	42	20	47.62	22	52.38
California State University, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Center For Psychological Studies, Albany	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Central Michigan University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
College of Notre Dame, Belmont	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Colorado State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Depaul University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Duke University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Duquesne University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Forrest Institute of Professional Psychology	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Florida Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	9	5	55.56	4	44.44
Georgia School of Professional Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Graduate Center For Child Development & Psychother	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Indiana University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Illiois Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
John F. Kennedy University, Orinda	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
La Jolla University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Long Island University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Loyola University of Chicago	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

* Total includes scores for the *Jurisprudence and Professional Ethics Oral Examination*

(Continued on page 22)



June 2000 Oral Examination Results by School

(Continued from page 21)

School Name	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
Minnesota School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New York University	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Northern California Graduate University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
New School University, New York	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Northern Arizona University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Ohio State University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Out-of-Country	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Out-of-State	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Pepperdine University	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Purdue University, Calumet	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	22	9	40.91	13	59.09
Pacific Western University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Pepperdine University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies, San	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Professional School of Psychology	9	4	44.44	5	55.56
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psycholo	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	8	4	50.00	4	50.00
Stanford University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Seton Hall University, New Jersey	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Texas A & M	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Texas Tech University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	11	6	54.55	5	45.45
UC, Berkeley	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Davis	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Los Angeles	9	1	11.11	8	88.89
UC, San Diego	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Santa Barbara	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
Union Institute	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Arkansas	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Cincinnati	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Colorado	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Denver	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
University of Georgia	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Michigan	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Mississippi	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Missouri, Columbia	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of North Carolina, Charlotte	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 23)



June 2000 Oral Examination Results by School

(Continued from page 22)

School Name	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing Exam	Passing Percent	#Applicants Failing	Fail Percent
University of North Dakota	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Oregon	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Pittsburgh	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Saskatchewan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of South Carolina, Columbia	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Tennessee, Memphis	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Texas, Austin	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Utah	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	27	6	22.22	21	77.78
Univ of Massachusetts, Amherst	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Iowa	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University For Humanistic Studies, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Maryland, College Park	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Minnesota - Minneapolis	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Montreal	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Nebraska, Lincoln	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	8	6	75.00	2	25.00
University of Southern Mississippi	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Toronto	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Washington	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
University of Wisconsin - Madison	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of The Pacific, Stockton	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Virginia Commonwealth University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Virginia Consortium Program In Clinical Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Western Michigan University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Washington State University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
West Virginia University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Western American University	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Western Institute For Social Research, San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Wheaton College, Mass.	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Wright Institute, Berkeley	13	7	53.85	6	46.15
Yeshiva University - Bronx, NY	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Grand Total	542	258	47.60	284	52.40



California Board of Psychology Members

<i>Martin Greenberg, Ph.D., President</i>	<i>Pamela Harmell, Ph.D.</i>
<i>Emil Rodolfa, Ph.D., Vice-President</i>	<i>Lisa Kalustian</i>
<i>Mary Ellen Early</i>	<i>Mary McMillan</i>
<i>Judith Janaro Fabian, Ph.D.</i>	<i>Marilyn Palarea</i>

Staff Members

Thomas O'Connor, Executive Officer
Suzanne Taylor, Assistant Executive Officer (Retired)
Jeffrey Thomas, Assistant Executive Officer
Kathi Burns, Enforcement Coordinator
Richard Hodgkin, Licensing/Registration Analyst
Lani Snyder, Licensing/Registration Analyst
Annette Brown, Licensing/Registration Analyst
Mary Laackmann, Enforcement Analyst
Diana Crosby, Business Services Technician
Tammy Bailey, Equipment/Supply Technician
Anthony Lum, Enforcement Clerk

*The Board of
Psychology is
committed to the
protection of the
health, safety, and
welfare of consumers
of psychological
services.*

